



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,566	10/31/2002	Yi-chen Chang	9747-US-PA	7637

31561 7590 05/05/2005

JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE
7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100
ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2
TAIPEI, 100
TAIWAN

EXAMINER

LEFLORE, LAUREL E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/065,566	Applicant(s) CHANG, YI-CHEN	
	Examiner Laurel E LeFlore	Art Unit 2673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 21, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claims 21 and 22, which depend from claims 1 and 12 respectively, recite, "wherein the discharging unit is coupled to a point for connecting the light-emitting device and the driving circuit." However, claims 1 and 12 each recite, "the driving circuit comprising: a light emitting device...and a discharging unit". It is unclear how the discharging unit can be couple to a point connecting the light-emitting device and the driving circuit if both the discharging unit and the light-emitting device are included in the driving circuit.
4. Claim 23 recites the limitations "the discharging unit" in the first line of the claim and "the driving circuit" in the second line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 12-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sekiya et al. 6,583,775 B1.

7. In regard to claim 1, Sekiya discloses a driving circuit, depicted in figure 1, for a display device having a plurality of pixels. See column 6, lines 30-32, disclosing, "there is provided an image display apparatus, comprising a plurality of pixels arranged in a matrix". Sekiya further discloses that driving circuit is used for driving the light-emitting device in each pixel. See column 10, lines 58-60, disclosing, "The light emitting element OLED emits light with a brightness value which varies depending upon the amount of current supplied thereto."

Sekiya further discloses that the driving circuit comprises a light-emitting device driving unit coupled to the light-emitting device for providing a driving current to the light-emitting device selectively. See column 10, lines 64-67, disclosing, "The second thin film transistor TFT2 controls the amount of current to be supplied to the light emitting element OLED in response to the brightness information written in the holding capacitor C."

Sekiya further discloses that the driving circuit comprises a discharging unit coupled to the light-emitting device driving unit for discharging the light-emitting device according to the voltage level of a control signal. See column 11, lines 29-33, disclosing, "When a third thin film transistor TFT 3 is placed into an on state with the control signal, the corresponding holding capacitor Cs discharges and the gate-source

voltage V_{gs} of the second thin film transistor TFT2 becomes 0 V. Consequently, the current to flow to the light emitting element OLED is cut off."

Sekiya further discloses that such discharging occurs as soon as the light-emitting device driving unit provides a driving current to the light-emitting device. See column 11, lines 13-18, disclosing, "within a period of one scanning cycle after brightness information is written into the pixels PXL...the light emitting elements are placed into an extinguished state from a lit state."

8. In regard to claim 2, Sekiya discloses that the driving circuit may further include a light-emitting device selection unit coupled to the light-emitting device driving unit for receiving a scan signal and a data signal. See figure 1 and column 10, lines 60-63, disclosing, "The first active element TFT1 is controlled by the corresponding scanning line X and writes brightness information given thereto from the corresponding data line Y into the holding capacitor C_s included in the pixel PXL."

Sekiya further discloses that when the scan signal and the data signal are at logic level "1", the light-emitting device selection unit enables the light-emitting device driving unit to provide a driving current to the light-emitting device. See column 10, line 67 to column 11, line 4, disclosing, "The writing of the brightness information into the pixel PXL is performed by applying an electric signal (data potential V_{data}) corresponding to the brightness information to the data line Y in a state wherein the scanning line X is selected." It is understood that a selected scanning line and a data line with brightness information are at a logic level "1".

Art Unit: 2673

9. In regard to claim 3, Sekiya discloses that the control signal uses the scan signal from the next pixel. See column 15, lines 15-18, disclosing an embodiment in which “no special stopping control line is provided, but duty control of the pixels PXL is performed making use of the scanning lines X1 to XN. To this end, in place of the stopping control line drive circuit 23, a control circuit 23' is provided separately from the scanning line drive circuit 21.” Further see figure 8 and note that control circuit 23' uses scanning lines from the scanning line drive circuit 21.

10. In regard to claim 4, Sekiya further discloses that the discharging unit discharges the light-emitting device when the scan signal on the next pixel is at a logic level “1” or a high voltage level. See rejection of claim 3 and column 16, lines 17-24, disclosing, “scanning line X is selected when the corresponding output of the control circuit 23' is H (high level) and the vertical clock signal VCK is VCK=H (high level)...the pixels connected to a scanning line X selected by the control circuit 23' stop the emission of light”.

11. In regard to claim 5, Sekiya discloses that the discharging unit is coupled to a ground potential so that electric charges are discharged from the light-emitting device to the ground. Note in figure 1 that the source of TFT3 is connected to ground.

12. In regard to claim 7, see rejection of claim 1.

13. In regard to claim 8, Sekiya discloses that the gate terminal of the transistor is connected to the control signal terminal. See rejection of claim 1 and column 11, lines 25-27, disclosing, “The control signal is applied over a stopping control line Z...to the

Art Unit: 2673

third thing film transistors TFT3". Note in figure 1 that the gate of TFT3 is connected to line Z.

Sekiya further discloses that the drain terminal of the transistor is connected to a ground potential so that electric charges in the light-emitting device discharge to the ground when the transistor is turned on by the control signal. See rejection of claim 5. Note that the drain of TFT3 is connected to ground when TFT3 receives a control signal at its gate.

14. In regard to claim 10, see rejection of claim 1.
15. In regard to claim 12, see rejection of claim 1.
16. In regard to claim 13, see rejection of claim 2.
17. In regard to claim 14, see rejection of claim 3.
18. In regard to claim 15, see rejection of claim 4.
19. In regard to claim 16, see rejection of claim 5.
20. In regard to claim 18, see rejection of claim 1.
21. In regard to claim 19, see rejection of claim 2.
22. In regard to claim 20, see rejection of claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiya et al. 6,583,775 B1 in view of Hack et al. 2002/0030647 A1.

25. In regard to claim 11, Sekiya discloses an invention similar to that which is claimed in claim 11. See rejection of claim 1 for similarities. Sekiya does not disclose that the light-emitting device includes a molecular light-emitting diode.

Hack discloses in paragraph [0056], "in the preferred embodiments of the present invention, the phosphorescent emission is produced by the radiative emission from triplet excited states of phosphorescent molecules in the emissive layer. The phosphorescent molecules are excited to their triplet excited states by the energy provided by the recombination of the holes and electrons that are produced in the emissive layer when a voltage is applied across an OLED." These phosphorescent OLEDs are molecular light-emitting diodes, as best understood.

Hack further teaches the use of such phosphorescent OLEDs in paragraph [0013], "There is, in addition, a need to combine these improved lower cost pixel circuits with OLEDs that also have improved performance characteristics. In particular, due to the many benefits and advantages that are provided by OLEDs, especially including overall energy efficiency, there has been much effort in recent years to find materials having still further improved OLED electroluminescent efficiencies...More recent work has demonstrated that OLEDs with higher power efficiencies can be made using organic molecules that emit light from their triplet state, defined as phosphorescence...phosphorescent OLEDs have a theoretical internal quantum efficiency of 100% ...As a consequence, since the discovery that phosphorescent

materials could be used in an OLED, there has been much interest in developing displays that can effectively utilize the unusually high electroluminescent efficiencies that are possible for phosphorescent OLEDs."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Sekiya by having the light-emitting device include a molecular light-emitting diode, as in the invention of Hack. One would have been motivated to make such a change based on the teaching of Hack that such diodes have "unusually high electroluminescent efficiencies" and "improved performance characteristics".

26. Claims 6, 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiya et al. 6,583,775 B1 in view of Filliman 5,255,220.

27. In regard to claim 6, Sekiya discloses an invention similar to that which is disclosed in claim 6. See rejection of claims 1 and 5 for similarities. Note in the rejection of claim 5 that Sekiya discloses that the discharging unit is coupled to a ground potential so that electric charges are discharged from the light-emitting device to the ground. Sekiya does not, however, disclose that the discharging unit is coupled to a negative voltage so that electric charges are discharged from the light-emitting device to the negative voltage terminal.

Filliman discloses an invention in which discharge occurs when a transistor is connected to a negative voltage. See figure 3 and column 6, lines 21-23, disclosing that the transistor Q1 "will discharge the storage node 305 if the write data input row to which terminal 302 is low (i.e., ground or negative)."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Sekiya by having the discharging unit coupled to a negative voltage instead of ground so that the electric charges are discharged from the light-emitting device to the negative voltage terminal, as in the invention of Filliman. One would have been motivated to make such a change based on the teaching of Filliman that discharge will occur to a low terminal, which is also true of the invention of Sekiya, and based on the further teaching of Filliman that such a low terminal is a "ground or negative".

28. In regard to claims 9 and 17, see rejection of claim 6.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant has amended the specification to overcome the objections to the specification and drawings of the paper dated 1 October 2004. Objections to the specification and drawings are withdrawn.

30. Applicant's arguments filed 1 October 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

31. On pages 11-12, applicant argues that "the applicants can't find that Sekiya has disclosed, taught or suggested that 'to discharge the light-emitting device' as disclosed in the present application" and "in the application, 'to discharge the light-emitting device' means to remove the electric charges out of the 'light-emitting device'." However, as the applicant notes on page 11, Sekiya discloses "the corresponding holding capacitor Cs discharges...Consequently, the current to flow to the light emitting element OLED is cut off." Examiner asserts that cutting off current to an OLED does "remove the electric

Art Unit: 2673

charges out of the" OLED. Thus, the OLED is discharged, since it is not receiving current or "charge".

32. Applicant argues on page 12 that "Filliman does not disclose, teach or suggest any subject matter such as 'light-emitting device,' 'light-emitting device driving unit,' or 'discharging unit' or others." In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Note that these features are disclosed by Sekiya.

33. In response to applicant's argument that Filliman is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Filliman teaches the use of a transistor connected to a negative voltage for discharge.

Conclusion

34. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2673

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurel E LeFlore whose telephone number is (571) 272-7672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LEE
LEL

27 April 2005


BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600